arXiv:1106.2337v4 [quant-ph] 24 Apr 2012

Upper Bounds on the Quantum Capacity of Some Two-Qubit Channels

Yingkai Ouyang,
Department of Combinatorics and Optimization
University of Waterloo, Institute of Quantum Computing,
200 University Avenue West, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1, Canada
(`y3ouyang@math.uwaterloo.ca`)

April 25, 2012

Abstract

Evaluating the quantum capacity of the quantum channels is an important but difficult problem, even for channels of low input and output dimension. For example, depolarizing channels are important quantum channels, but do not have tight numerical bounds. We prove upper bounds on the quantum capacity of our two-qubit degradable amplitude damping channels and its twirled counterparts, such as two-qubit Pauli channels and four dimension depolarizing channels. Exploiting the notion of covariance of quantum channels, we study the structure of our two-qubit degradable amplitude damping channels, and show that their quantum capacity is equivalent to the optimal value of a concave program with linear constraints.

1 Introduction

The quantum capacity of a quantum channel is the maximum rate at which quantum information can be transmitted reliably across it, given arbitrarily many uses of it [1]. The quantum capacity of many classes of channels is undetermined. This makes evaluating bounds for the quantum capacity of certain classes of quantum channels an interesting mathematical problem.

However, evaluating the quantum capacity of a quantum channel is in general an infinite dimension optimization problem, and hence difficult, even for quantum channels with low dimension input and output states. Depolarizing channels $\mathcal{D}_{p,d}$ are particularly easy to describe, where p and d are the noise strength p and dimension of $\mathcal{D}_{p,d}$ respectively. Depolarizing channels $\mathcal{D}_{p,d}$ map a d dimension input state to a convex combination of the maximally mixed state of dimension d and the input state. In particular,

$$\mathcal{D}_{p,d}(\rho) = \rho\left(1 - p\frac{d^2-1}{d^2}\right) + \frac{\mathbb{1}_d}{d}\left(p\frac{d^2-1}{d^2}\right)$$

where $\mathbb{1}_d$ is the identity matrix of dimension d. Upper bounds [2, 3, 4, 5, 6] and lower bounds [7, 8, 9, 10] on $Q(\mathcal{D}_{p,2})$ have been studied, but bounds on $Q(\mathcal{D}_{p,2})$ are still not tight for $p \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ despite more than a decade of research. Even less is known about $Q(\mathcal{D}_{p,d})$ for $d > 2$.

There are however quantum channels for which we know how to evaluate the quantum capacity – degradable and anti-degradable quantum channels [11]. Loosely speaking, degradable channels can simulate the environment while anti-degradable channels can be simulated by the environment. Degradable channels can also be used to obtain upper bounds on the quantum capacity of qubit depolarizing channels [5, 6]. In particular, Smith and Smolin [6] used the entire family of degradable qubit depolarizing channels to obtain the currently best upper bounds on qubit depolarizing channels.

Qubit amplitude damping quantum channels are examples of qubit degradable channels. These channels model spontaneous decay in two-level quantum systems, and hence knowledge of their quantum capacity is a physically relevant problem [12]. An interesting fact is that these channels are covariant [13] with respect to the diagonal Pauli matrices [14]. This notion of covariance can help us simplify the evaluation of the quantum capacity of these channels.

In this paper, we study upper bounds on the quantum capacity of some two-qubit quantum channels. We introduce two-qubit amplitude damping channels which extend qubit amplitude damping channels, and obtain a simple procedure to evaluate their quantum capacity, by proving that they are covariant with respect to diagonal Pauli matrices. We also Pauli-twirl two-qubit amplitude damping channels using Smith and Smolin's methodology [6] to obtain upper bounds on the quantum capacity of some two-qubit Pauli channels, which we state as Theorem 4. We then apply Theorem 4 to obtain upper bounds on the quantum capacity of four dimension depolarizing channels (see Corollary 2) and the quantum capacity of locally symmetric Pauli channels (see Corollary 3).

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2 we review the background material needed for this paper. In Section 3 we introduce a family of two-qubit amplitude damping channels and prove conditions for which they are degradable in Lemma 2. In Section 4, we discuss the relation of quantum channels that are covariant with respect to diagonal Pauli matrices and the quantum capacity of certain channels. In Theorem 1 we prove that the quantum capacity of a degradable quantum channel can be simplified if it and its complementary channel are both covariant with respect to diagonal Pauli matrices. In Theorem 2 we prove that channels with Kraus operators that all can be written as a product of a diagonal matrix and a Pauli matrix satisfy our requirement for covariance. In Section 5, we introduce results related to twirling of quantum channels. In particular, Lemma 6 gives an upper bound on the quantum capacity of quantum channels that are invariant under Pauli twirling. In Section 6, we give upper bounds on the quantum capacity of some two-qubit channels.

2 Preliminaries

We use the notation ':=' to mean that the expression on its left hand side is defined as the expression on its right hand side. Define $\eta(z) := -z \log_2 z$ where $z \in [0,1]$ and $\eta(0) := 0$. Define the Pauli group on m qubits modulo phases, to be $\mathcal{P}_m := \{\mathbb{1}, \mathsf{X}, \mathsf{Y}, \mathsf{Z}\}^{\otimes m}$. For all $\mathsf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_m$, define $\mathrm{wt}(\mathsf{P})$ to be the weight of P, which is the number of qubits on which the operator P acts non-trivially on. For any $\mathsf{V}, \mathsf{W} \in \mathcal{P}_m$, define

$$c[\mathsf{W},\mathsf{V}] := \begin{cases} +1 & , \quad \mathsf{WV} = \mathsf{VW} \\ -1 & , \quad \mathsf{WV} = -\mathsf{VW} \end{cases} . \tag{2.1}$$

Let D_d be the set of all diagonal matrices of size d.

For a complex separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$, let $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{K})$ be the set of bounded linear operators mapping $\mathcal{K}$ to $\mathcal{K}$. In this paper, we only deal with finite Hilbert spaces. Define the set of quantum states on Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ to be $\mathfrak{D}(\mathcal{K})$ where $\mathfrak{D}(\mathcal{K})$ is the set of all positive semi-definite and trace one operators in $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{K})$. Let $\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{C}^d) \subset \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ be the set of all dimension d quantum states. A quantum channel $\Phi : \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ is a completely positive and trace-preserving (CPT) linear map, and can be written in its Kraus form [15]

$$\Phi(\rho) = \sum_k \mathsf{A}_k \rho \mathsf{A}_k^\dagger, \quad \sum_k \mathsf{A}_k^\dagger \mathsf{A}_k = \mathbb{1}_{d_A}$$

where $d_A = \dim(\mathcal{H}_A)$. We can also write down the action of a quantum channel Φ in terms of an isometry on the input state. Now define an isometry $W : \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_E \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$

$$\mathsf{W} = \sum_k |k\rangle \otimes \mathsf{A}_k.$$

Here $\{|k\rangle\}$ is an orthornormal set, and spans a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_E$ that we define as the environment. Then observe that

$$\mathsf{W}\rho\mathsf{W}^\dagger = \sum_{j,k} |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes \mathsf{A}_j \rho \mathsf{A}_k^\dagger.$$

and that

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_E}(\mathsf{W}\rho\mathsf{W}^\dagger) = \Phi(\rho)$$

Then we can define the **complementary channel** $\Phi^C : \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_E)$ [16] as

$$\Phi^C(\rho) = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B}(\mathsf{W}\rho\mathsf{W}^\dagger).$$

Since we are free to choose the orthornormal basis of the environment $\mathcal{H}_E$, Φ^C is only defined up to a unitary. We use the above definition as our canonical one. Let $\Phi^C(\rho) = \sum_\mu \mathsf{R}_\mu \rho \mathsf{R}_\mu{}^\dagger$. One can check [17] that the j-th row of R_μ is the μ-th row of A_j. For completeness, we include the proof here.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi^C(\rho) &= \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B}(\mathsf{W}\rho\mathsf{W}^\dagger) \\
&= \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B}\left(\sum_{j,k} |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes \mathsf{A}_j\rho\mathsf{A}_k^\dagger\right) \\
&= \sum_{j,k} |j\rangle\langle k| \,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathsf{A}_j\rho\mathsf{A}_k^\dagger\right) \\
&= \sum_{j,k} |j\rangle \sum_\mu \langle\mu| \left(\mathsf{A}_j\rho\mathsf{A}_k^\dagger\right) |\mu\rangle\langle k| \\
&= \sum_\mu \left(\sum_j |j\rangle\langle\mu|\mathsf{A}_j\right) \rho \left(\sum_k \mathsf{A}_k^\dagger|\mu\rangle\langle k|\right) \\
&= \sum_\mu \mathsf{R}_\mu\rho\mathsf{R}_\mu{}^\dagger \qquad (2.2)
\end{aligned}$$

where $R_\mu = \sum_j |j\rangle\langle\mu|\mathsf{A}_j$.

2.1 Quantum Capacity

For a quantum channel $\Phi : \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, define

$$I_{coh}(\Phi, \rho) := S(\Phi(\rho)) - S(\Phi^C(\rho))$$

and

$$I_{coh}(\Phi) := \max_{\rho\in\mathfrak{D}(\mathcal{H}_A)} I_{coh}(\Phi,\rho)$$

where

$$S(\rho) := \mathrm{Tr}(\rho\log_2\rho)$$

is the von Neumann entropy of a given density matrix ρ. I_{coh} is a function called the coherent information first introduced by [18]. It was shown by [19, 11, 20] that the quantum capacity of Φ is

$$Q(\Phi) = \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}I_{coh}(\Phi^{\otimes n}), \tag{2.3}$$

and the expression on the right hand side of (2.3) exists[1].

2.2 Pauli Twirling

Twirling is a special way to obtain convex combinations of a set of channels. Given a channel $\Phi : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ and a set of unitary operators $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$, the twirl of Φ with respect to $\mathcal{U}$ is an operator $\Phi_{\mathcal{U}}$ that maps ρ to the state

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{U}}(\rho) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|}\sum_{\mathsf{U}\in\mathcal{U}} \mathsf{U}^\dagger\Phi(\mathsf{U}\rho\mathsf{U}^\dagger)\mathsf{U}. \tag{2.4}$$

When $d = 2^m$, we may twirl channel Φ with respect to $\mathcal{P}_m$ to get a channel $\hat{\Phi} = \Phi_{\mathcal{P}_m}$. We call $\hat{\Phi}$ the Pauli twirl of Φ, and $\hat{\Phi}$ maps an m qubit state ρ to

$$\hat{\Phi}(\rho) := \Phi_{\mathcal{P}_m}(\rho) = \frac{1}{2^{2m}}\sum_{\mathsf{P}\in\mathcal{P}_m} \mathsf{P}\Phi(\mathsf{P}\rho\mathsf{P})\mathsf{P}. \tag{2.5}$$

Let the set of Kraus operators of Φ be $\mathcal{A}$. The authors in [22] proved that the set of the Kraus operators of $\hat{\Phi}$ is

$$\left\{\sqrt{\sum_{\mathsf{A}\in\mathcal{A}} |\,\mathrm{Tr}(\mathsf{PA})/2^m|^2}\,\mathsf{P} : \quad \mathsf{P}\in\mathcal{P}_m\right\}. \tag{2.6}$$

2.3 Degradable Channels

A channel $\mathcal{N} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^{d'})$ is **degradable** [16] if there exists a quantum operation Ψ such that

$$\Psi\circ\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}^C,$$

that is

$$\Psi(\mathcal{N}(\rho)) = \mathcal{N}^C(\rho), \quad \forall\rho\in\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{C}^d)$$

and is antidegradable if its complementary channel $\mathcal{N}^C$ is degradable. A channel $\mathcal{T}$ is a **degradable extension** [6] of channel $\mathcal{N}$ if $\mathcal{T}$ is degradable and there exists a quantum operation Ψ such that $\Psi\circ\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{N}$. From [6] and [5] we know that if $\mathcal{T}$ is a degradable extension of some channel, then $Q(\mathcal{T}) = I_{coh}(\mathcal{T})$. Degradable extensions allow us to construct upper bounds of quantum channels in the following way.

---

[1] see Appendix A of [21]

Lemma 1 (Smith, Smolin [6]) *Let* $\mathcal{N}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{N}_k : \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ *be degradable channels. Then for all non-negative* $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k$ *such that* $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i = 1$*, there exists a quantum channel* $\mathcal{T} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$*, a degradable extension of* $\sum_i \lambda_i \mathcal{N}_i$*, such that*

$$Q\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i \mathcal{N}_i\right) \leq Q(\mathcal{T}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i Q(\mathcal{N}_i). \tag{2.7}$$

2.4 No-Cloning Bound

Cerf's no-cloning bounds [2] can be used to obtain upper bounds on the quantum capacity of depolarizing channels. In particular, by Cerf's result, $\mathcal{D}_{p,d}$ is a degradable and anti-degradable channel when

$$p = \frac{d}{2d+2}\frac{d^2-1}{d^2} = \frac{d^2-1}{2d(d+1)} = \frac{d-1}{2d}. \tag{2.8}$$

3 Two-qubit Amplitude Damping Channels

Define the linear map $\Phi_{\mathbf{a}} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4)$

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{a}}(\rho) := \sum_{i=0}^{3} \mathsf{K}_i \rho \mathsf{K}_i^\dagger \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{K}_0 &= \sum_{i=0}^{3} a_{0,i} |i\rangle\langle i| \\ \mathsf{K}_1 &= a_{1,1}|0\rangle\langle 1| + a_{1,2}|2\rangle\langle 3| \\ \mathsf{K}_2 &= a_{2,1}|0\rangle\langle 2| + a_{2,2}|1\rangle\langle 3| \\ \mathsf{K}_3 &= a_{3,1}|0\rangle\langle 3| \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

where $\mathbf{a} = (a_{0,0}, a_{0,1}, a_{0,2}, a_{0,3}, a_{1,1}, a_{1,2}, a_{2,1}, a_{2,2}, a_{3,1}) \geq \mathbf{0}$. When

$$a_{0,0} = 1, \quad a_{0,1}^2 + a_{1,1}^2 = 1, \quad a_{0,2}^2 + a_{2,1}^2 = 1, \quad a_{0,3}^2 + a_{1,2}^2 + a_{2,2}^2 + a_{3,1}^2 = 1, \tag{3.3}$$

then $\Phi_{\mathbf{a}}$ is also a quantum channel.

For $x, y, z \geq 0, 1 - 2y - z \geq 0$, define $\Phi_{x,y,z} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4)$ where

$$\Phi_{x,y,z} := \Phi_{(1,s_1,s_1,s_2,\sqrt{x},\sqrt{y},\sqrt{x},\sqrt{y},\sqrt{z})} \tag{3.4}$$

to be a quantum channel with Kraus operators

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{A}_0 &= |0\rangle\langle 0| + s_1(|1\rangle\langle 1| + |2\rangle\langle 2|) + s_2|3\rangle\langle 3| \\ \mathsf{A}_1 &= \sqrt{x}|0\rangle\langle 1| + \sqrt{y}|2\rangle\langle 3| \\ \mathsf{A}_2 &= \sqrt{x}|0\rangle\langle 2| + \sqrt{y}|1\rangle\langle 3| \\ \mathsf{A}_3 &= \sqrt{z}|0\rangle\langle 3| \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where $s_1 = \sqrt{1-x}, s_2 = \sqrt{1-2y-z}$. For $x, y, z \geq 0, 1 - 2y - z \geq 0$, we call $\Phi_{x,y,z}$ a two-qubit amplitude damping channel. Observe $\Phi_{\gamma,\gamma(1-\gamma),\gamma^2} = \Phi_\gamma \otimes \Phi_\gamma$ where Φ_γ is the qubit amplitude damping channel with Kraus operators $\sqrt{\gamma}|0\rangle\langle 1|$ and $|0\rangle\langle 0| + \sqrt{1-\gamma}|1\rangle\langle 1|$ for $\gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$.

Let $\mathfrak{K}$ be the family of quantum channels with Kraus operators of the form (3.2). Then we prove the following.

Theorem 1 *$\mathcal{K} \in \mathfrak{K}$ if and only if $\mathcal{K}^C \in \mathfrak{K}$.*

Proof: Using the recipe of [17], if the Kraus operators of $\mathcal{K}$ have the form of (3.2), then the channel $\mathcal{K}^C$ has the Kraus operators

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{K}_0' &= a_{0,0}|0\rangle\langle 0| + \sum_{i=1}^{3} a_{i,1}|i\rangle\langle i| \\ \mathsf{K}_1' &= a_{0,1}|0\rangle\langle 1| + a_{2,2}|2\rangle\langle 3| \\ \mathsf{K}_2' &= a_{0,2}|0\rangle\langle 2| + a_{1,2}|1\rangle\langle 3| \\ \mathsf{K}_3' &= a_{0,3}|0\rangle\langle 3| \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

which is also of the form (3.2). This proves the forward direction. Since $(\mathcal{K}^C)^C = \mathcal{K}$, the reverse implication also holds. □

The linear map $\Phi_{x,y,z}$ can also be a degradable quantum channel for suitable values of x, y, z.

Lemma 2 *$\Phi_{x,y,z}$ is a degradable channel with degrading map $\mathcal{G}$ when $x, y, z \geq 0$ and $2y + z < 1, x < \frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof: Note that $\Phi_{x,y,z}$ is a quantum channel for $x, y, z \geq 0$ and $2y + z < 1$ which Kraus operators given by (3.5). Also note that its complementary channel $\Phi^C_{x,y,z} = \Phi_{1-x,y,1-2y-z}$ has the Kraus operators

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{R}_0 &= |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sqrt{x}|1\rangle\langle 1| + \sqrt{x}|2\rangle\langle 2| + \sqrt{z}|3\rangle\langle 3| \\ \mathsf{R}_1 &= \sqrt{1-x}|0\rangle\langle 1| + \sqrt{y}|2\rangle\langle 3| \\ \mathsf{R}_2 &= \sqrt{1-x}|0\rangle\langle 2| + \sqrt{y}|1\rangle\langle 3| \\ \mathsf{R}_3 &= \sqrt{1-2y-z}|0\rangle\langle 3|. \end{aligned}$$

Consider another amplitude damping channel $\mathcal{G} = \Phi_{g,h,k}$ with Kraus operators

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{G}_0 &= |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sqrt{1-g}(|1\rangle\langle 1| + |2\rangle\langle 2|) + \sqrt{1-2h-k}|3\rangle\langle 3| \\ \mathsf{G}_1 &= \sqrt{g}|0\rangle\langle 1| + \sqrt{h}|2\rangle\langle 3| \\ \mathsf{G}_2 &= \sqrt{g}|0\rangle\langle 2| + \sqrt{h}|1\rangle\langle 3| \\ \mathsf{G}_3 &= \sqrt{k}|0\rangle\langle 3| \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} g &= \frac{1-2x}{1-x}, \quad h = \frac{gy}{(1-2y-z)} \\ k &= 1 - 2h - \frac{z}{1-2y-z}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

When $x, y, z \geq 0$ and $2y + z < 1, x < \frac{1}{2}$, $\mathcal{G}$ is a valid quantum operation.

We want to find the conditions where $\mathcal{G} \circ \Phi_{x,y,z} = \Phi^C_{x,y,z}$ which means that $\mathcal{G}$ is a degrading map that takes the output state of $\Phi_{x,y,z}$ to the output state of $\Phi^C_{x,y,z}$. By the Kraus representation,

$$\mathcal{G}(\Phi_{x,y,z}(\rho)) = \sum_{k,\ell \in \{0,1,2,3\}} \mathsf{G_k} \mathsf{A}_\ell \rho \mathsf{A}_\ell{}^\dagger \mathsf{G_k}{}^\dagger.$$

Hence in this representation $\Phi^C_{x,y,z} = \mathcal{G} \circ \Phi_{x,y,z}$ is a quantum channel with the sixteen Kraus operators

$$\mathsf{G_k} \mathsf{A}_\ell$$

for $k, \ell \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$. Now we evaluate $\mathsf{G_k}\mathsf{A}_\ell$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{G}_1\mathsf{A}_3 = \mathsf{G}_1\mathsf{A}_1 = 0, \mathsf{G}_1\mathsf{A}_2 &= \sqrt{\frac{1-2x}{1-x}} y|0\rangle\langle 3| \\
\mathsf{G}_2\mathsf{A}_3 = \mathsf{G}_2\mathsf{A}_2 = 0, \mathsf{G}_2\mathsf{A}_1 &= \sqrt{\frac{1-2x}{1-x}} y|0\rangle\langle 3| \\
\mathsf{G}_3\mathsf{A}_3 = \mathsf{G}_3\mathsf{A}_2 = \mathsf{G}_3\mathsf{A}_1 &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Also we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{G}_1\mathsf{A}_0 &= \sqrt{1-2x}|0\rangle\langle 1| + \sqrt{\frac{1-2x}{1-x}} y|2\rangle\langle 3| \\
\mathsf{G}_2\mathsf{A}_0 &= \sqrt{1-2x}|0\rangle\langle 2| + \sqrt{\frac{1-2x}{1-x}} y|1\rangle\langle 3| \\
\mathsf{G}_3\mathsf{A}_0 &= \sqrt{\frac{1-x-2y(2-3x)}{1-x}}|0\rangle\langle 3|.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{G}_0\mathsf{A}_1 &= \sqrt{x}|0\rangle\langle 1| + \sqrt{\frac{xy}{1-x}}|2\rangle\langle 3| \\
\mathsf{G}_0\mathsf{A}_2 &= \sqrt{x}|0\rangle\langle 2| + \sqrt{\frac{xy}{1-x}}|1\rangle\langle 3| \\
\mathsf{G}_0\mathsf{A}_3 &= \sqrt{z}|0\rangle\langle 3|.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe then that $\mathsf{G}_0\mathsf{A}_1 = \sqrt{\frac{x}{1-2x}}\mathsf{G}_1\mathsf{A}_0$ and $\mathsf{G}_0\mathsf{A}_2 = \sqrt{\frac{x}{1-2x}}\mathsf{G}_2\mathsf{A}_0$. Thus applying the Kraus operators $\mathsf{G_i}\mathsf{A}_0$ and $\mathsf{G}_0\mathsf{A_i}$ is equivalent to applying the Kraus operator $\mathsf{R_i}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Similarly, applying the Kraus operators $\mathsf{G}_1\mathsf{A}_2, \mathsf{G}_2\mathsf{A}_1$ and $\mathsf{G}_3\mathsf{A}_0$ is equivalent to applying the Kraus operator R_3. Moreover, since $1 - g = \frac{x}{1-x}$ and $(1 - 2h - k)(1 - 2y - z) = z$, we have that $\mathsf{G}_0\mathsf{A}_0 = \mathsf{R}_0$. Therefore we have shown that $\Phi_{x,y,z}$ is degradable with degrading map $\mathcal{G}$ when $x, y, z \geq 0$ and $2y + z < 1, x < \frac{1}{2}$.$\square$

4 Covariant Channels

4.1 Quantum Capacity of Special Degradable Channels

In this paper we work with degradable channels Φ that map m qubits to m qubits. Since the coherent information of degradable channels is additive [16], the evaluation of $Q(\Phi)$ is a finite optimization problem. In particular

$$Q(\Phi) = \max_{\rho \in \mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{C}^{2^m})} I_{coh}(\Phi, \rho).$$

The main point of this section is the following theorem, which extends Wolf and Pérez-García's method [14], and generalizes an observation made by Giovannetti and Fazio [12] for the qubit amplitude damping channel.

Theorem 1 *Assume that Φ is a degradable channel. Also assume that Φ and Φ^C satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3. Let $\widetilde{D}_{2^m} \subset D_{2^m}$ be the set of diagonal density matrices of size 2^m. Then*

$$Q(\Phi) = \max_{\rho \in \widetilde{D}_{2^m}} I_{coh}(\Phi, \rho).$$

Properties of quantum channels covariant with respect to a locally compact group were studied by Holevo in [13]. We also study properties of special covariant quantum channels. In particular, we generalize the covariance property of qubit channels in equation 7 of [14], and give sufficient conditions for a quantum channel to be covariant under conjugation by certain diagonal matrices.

Lemma 3 (Covariance) *Let $\Phi : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^{2^m}) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^{2^m})$ be a linear map such that for all $\mathsf{W} \in \mathcal{P}_m$,*

$$\Phi(\mathsf{W}) = \sum_{\mathsf{V} \in \{\mathbb{1}, \mathsf{Z}\}^{\otimes m}} a_{\mathsf{W},\mathsf{V}} \mathsf{V}\mathsf{W} \tag{4.1}$$

for some $a_{\mathsf{W},\mathsf{V}} \in \mathbb{C}$. Then for all $\Lambda \in \{\mathbb{1}, \mathsf{Z}\}^{\otimes m}$ and for all $\rho \in \mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{C}^{2^m})$, we have

$$\Phi(\Lambda\rho\Lambda) = \Lambda\Phi(\rho)\Lambda.$$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi(\Lambda W \Lambda) &= (-1)^{c[\mathsf{W},\mathsf{V}]}\Phi((-1)^{c[\mathsf{W},\mathsf{V}]}\Lambda\mathsf{W}\Lambda) \\
&= (-1)^{c[\mathsf{W},\mathsf{V}]} \sum_{\mathsf{V} \in \{\mathbb{1}, \mathsf{Z}\}^{\otimes m}} a_{\mathsf{W},\mathsf{V}} \mathsf{V}((-1)^{c[\mathsf{W},\mathsf{V}]}\Lambda\mathsf{W}\Lambda) \\
&= \sum_{\mathsf{V} \in \{\mathbb{1}, \mathsf{Z}\}^{\otimes m}} a_{\mathsf{W},\mathsf{V}} \mathsf{V}(\Lambda\mathsf{W}\Lambda) \\
&= \Lambda \sum_{\mathsf{V} \in \{\mathbb{1}, \mathsf{Z}\}^{\otimes m}} a_{\mathsf{W},\mathsf{V}} \mathsf{V}\mathsf{W}\Lambda, \quad \because \Lambda\mathsf{V} = \mathsf{V}\Lambda \\
&= \Lambda \left(\sum_{\mathsf{V} \in \{\mathbb{1}, \mathsf{Z}\}^{\otimes m}} a_{\mathsf{W},\mathsf{V}} \mathsf{V}\mathsf{W} \right) \Lambda \\
&= \Lambda\Phi(\mathsf{W})\Lambda
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

The first equality follows from the linearity of Φ, the second equality follows because $(-1)^{c[\mathsf{W},\mathsf{V}]}\Lambda\mathsf{W}\Lambda = \mathsf{W}$, and the third equality follows from rearranging the scalar terms.

Now every m-qubit density matrix ρ can be expanded in the Pauli basis, so we can write

$$\rho = \sum_{\mathsf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_m} c_{\mathsf{P}} \mathsf{P}$$

for $c_{\mathsf{P}} \in \mathbb{C}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi(\Lambda\rho\Lambda) &= \Phi\left(\Lambda \sum_{\mathsf{P}\in\mathcal{P}_m} c_{\mathsf{P}}\mathsf{P}\Lambda\right) && \text{, by definition of } \rho \\
&= \sum_{\mathsf{P}\in\mathcal{P}_m} c_{\mathsf{P}}\Phi(\Lambda\mathsf{P}\Lambda) && \text{, by linearity of } \Phi \\
&= \sum_{\mathsf{P}\in\mathcal{P}_m} c_{\mathsf{P}}\Lambda\Phi(\mathsf{P})\Lambda && \text{, by (4.2)} \\
&= \Lambda\Phi\left(\sum_{\mathsf{P}\in\mathcal{P}_m} c_{\mathsf{P}}\mathsf{P}\right)\Lambda && \text{, by linearity of } \Phi \\
&= \Lambda\Phi(\rho)\Lambda && \text{, by definition of } \rho\ .\square
\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

It may not be immediately obvious that quantum channels of the form (4.1) exist, and hence we provide several examples of such quantum channels as well as sufficient conditions for their existence in Section 4.2.

To prove Theorem 1 we need another lemma.

Lemma 4 (Invariance) *Suppose that* Φ *and* Φ^C *are quantum channels that satisfy the requirements of Lemma 3. Then for all* $\Lambda \in \{\mathbb{1}, \mathsf{Z}\}^{\otimes m}$ *and for all* $\rho \in \mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{C}^{2^m})$*, we have*

$$I_{coh}(\Phi, \Lambda\rho\Lambda) = I_{coh}(\Phi, \rho).$$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned}
&I_{coh}(\Phi, \Lambda\rho\Lambda) \\
=&S(\Phi(\Lambda\rho\Lambda)) - S(\Phi^C(\Lambda\rho\Lambda)) \\
=&S(\Lambda\Phi(\rho)\Lambda) - S(\Lambda\Phi^C(\rho)\Lambda) && \text{, by Lemma 3} \\
=&S(\Phi(\rho)) - S(\Phi^C(\rho)) && \text{, by unitary invariance of } S \\
=&I_{coh}(\Phi, \rho). && \square
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Generalizing a step by [14], let $\mathcal{N} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^2) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ be the completely dephasing qubit channel with Kraus operators $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\mathbb{1}$ and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\mathsf{Z}$. For all $\rho \in \mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{C}^{2^m})$, by decomposing ρ in the Pauli basis, one can verify that

$$\mathcal{N}^{\otimes m}(\rho) = \rho'$$

where the diagonal entries of ρ' are equal to the diagonal entries of ρ and the off-diagonal entries of ρ' are zero. Note that $I_{coh}(\Phi, \rho)$ is a concave function of ρ for Φ degradable [23]. Now we prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1:

$$\begin{aligned}
&I_{coh}(\Phi, \mathcal{N}^{\otimes m}(\rho)) \\
=&I_{coh}\left(\Phi, \frac{1}{2^m}\sum_{\mathsf{A}\in\{\mathbb{1},\mathsf{Z}\}^{\otimes m}} \mathsf{A}\rho\mathsf{A}^\dagger\right) \\
\geq&\frac{1}{2^m}\sum_{\mathsf{A}\in\{\mathbb{1},\mathsf{Z}\}^{\otimes m}} I_{coh}(\Phi, \mathsf{A}\rho\mathsf{A}^\dagger) && \text{, by concavity [23]} \\
=&\frac{1}{2^m}\sum_{\mathsf{A}\in\{\mathbb{1},\mathsf{Z}\}^{\otimes m}} I_{coh}(\Phi, \rho) && \text{, by Lemma 4} \\
=&I_{coh}(\Phi, \rho)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, optimizing the coherent information of Φ over diagonal states suffices to obtain $Q(\Phi)$. □

4.2 Examples of Covariant Channels

There are many well-known examples of quantum channels of the form (4.1). The main result of this subsection is Theorem 2, which gives a sufficient condition for a quantum channel to satisfy (4.1) and hence satisfy the covariance property of Lemma 3.

Theorem 2 *Suppose that a quantum channel* $\Phi : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^{2^m}) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^{2^m})$ *has set of Kraus operators* K *such that*

$$\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{V_K}\mathsf{P_K}, \quad \mathsf{K} \in K \tag{4.5}$$

for some $\mathsf{V_K} \in D_{2^m}$ *and* $\mathsf{P_K} \in \mathcal{P}_m$*. Then* Φ *satisfies the condition of (4.1).*

We postpone the proof of Theorem 2 to Section 4.3.

Corollary 1 *The linear map* $\Phi_{\mathbf{a}}$ *defined by (3.2) that is a quantum channel satisfies the condition of (4.1).*

Proof: By Theorem 2, it suffices to show that every Kraus operator of Φ can be written in the form

$$\mathsf{K_i} = \mathsf{V_i}\mathsf{P_i} \tag{4.6}$$

for some $\mathsf{V_i} \in D_4$ and $\mathsf{P_i} \in \mathcal{P}_2$ for all $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$. We define the vectors $|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |2\rangle, |3\rangle$ to be the two qubit states $|0, 0\rangle, |0, 1\rangle, |1, 0\rangle, |1, 1\rangle$ respectively. Let us have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathsf{V_0} = \sum_{i=0}^{3} a_{0,i}|i\rangle\langle i|, \quad \mathsf{P_0} = \mathbb{1}\otimes\mathbb{1} \\
&\mathsf{V_1} = a_{1,1}|0\rangle\langle 0| - a_{1,2}|2\rangle\langle 2|, \quad \mathsf{P_1} = \mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{X} \\
&\mathsf{V_2} = a_{2,1}|0\rangle\langle 0| - a_{2,2}|1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad \mathsf{P_2} = \mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{Z} \\
&\mathsf{V_3} = |0\rangle\langle 0|, \quad \mathsf{P_3} = \mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{X}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Using equations (A.14), (A.15), (A.12), (A.13), (A.11) in the Appendix, we can verify that (4.6) holds. □

Consider the family of degradable channels introduced by [14] with Kraus operators

$$\begin{pmatrix} \cos\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & \cos\beta \end{pmatrix} \in D_2, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sin\beta \\ \sin\alpha & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sin\beta & 0 \\ 0 & \sin\alpha \end{pmatrix} \mathsf{X}.$$

Thus these Kraus operators are in the form required by Theorem 2. All Pauli channels also satisfy the requirements of Theorem 2. Then we can apply Theorem 2 to show that these channels are of the form (4.1) and are hence covariant in the sense of Lemma 3.

4.3 Proof of Theorem 2

Theorem 2 *For any positive integer m, n, let $\mathsf{L_1}, ..., \mathsf{L_n} \in D_{2^m}$ and $\mathsf{R_1}, ..., \mathsf{R_n} \in D_{2^m}$. Suppose that $\mathsf{W} \in \mathcal{P}_m$. Then there exists some $\mathsf{U} \in D_{2^m}$ such that*

$$\mathsf{UW} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathsf{L_i W R_i}. \tag{4.8}$$

Theorem 3 *Let $\mathsf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_m$. Let $\mathsf{V} \in D_{2^m}$. Then for every $\mathsf{W} \in \mathcal{P}_m$ we have*

$$(\mathsf{VP})\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{VP})^\dagger = \mathsf{LWR} \tag{4.9}$$

for some $\mathsf{L}, \mathsf{R} \in D_{2^m}$.

We prove Proposition 2 and Proposition 3 later in this subsection. By Proposition 3, for every $\mathsf{W} \in \mathcal{P}_m$ and for all $\mathsf{K} \in K$, $\mathsf{KWK}^\dagger = \mathsf{L_K W R_K}$ for some $\mathsf{L_K}, \mathsf{R_K} \in D_{2^m}$. Hence $\Phi(\mathsf{W}) = \sum_{\mathsf{K} \in K} \mathsf{L_K W R_K}$. Using Proposition 2, there exists a $\mathsf{U} \in D_{2^m}$ such that $\Phi(\mathsf{W}) = \mathsf{UW}$. □

Proof of Proposition 2 : In the Pauli basis, $\mathsf{R_i}$ is

$$\mathsf{R_i} = \sum_{\mathsf{V} \in \{\mathbb{1}, \mathsf{Z}\}^{\otimes m}} b_{i,\mathsf{V}} \mathsf{V} \tag{4.10}$$

for scalars $b_{i,\mathsf{V}} \in \mathbb{C}$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathsf{L_i W R_i} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathsf{L_i W} \sum_{\mathsf{V} \in \{\mathbb{1}, \mathsf{Z}\}^{\otimes m}} b_{i,\mathsf{V}} \mathsf{V} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathsf{L_i} \sum_{\mathsf{V} \in \{\mathbb{1}, \mathsf{Z}\}^{\otimes m}} b_{i,\mathsf{V}} c[\mathsf{V}, \mathsf{W}] \mathsf{VW} \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathsf{L_i} \sum_{\mathsf{V} \in \{\mathbb{1}, \mathsf{Z}\}^{\otimes m}} b_{i,\mathsf{V}} c[\mathsf{V}, \mathsf{W}] \mathsf{V} \right) \mathsf{W} \\ &= \mathsf{UW} \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

where

$$\mathsf{U} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathsf{L_i} \sum_{\mathsf{V} \in \{\mathbb{1}, \mathsf{Z}\}^{\otimes m}} b_{i,\mathsf{V}} c[\mathsf{V}, \mathsf{W}] \mathsf{V} \right). \tag{4.12}$$

Since D_{2^m} is closed under addition and multiplication, and U is expressed as a sum of products of elements of D_{2^m}, it follows that $\mathsf{U} \in D_{2^m}$. □

Proof of Proposition 3:

$$(\mathsf{VP})\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{VP})^\dagger = \mathsf{V}(\mathsf{PWP})V^\dagger = c[\mathsf{P},\mathsf{W}]\mathsf{VWV}^\dagger = \mathsf{LWR} \tag{4.13}$$

where

$$\mathsf{L} = c[\mathsf{P},\mathsf{W}]\mathsf{V} \in D_{2^m}, \quad \mathsf{R} = \mathsf{V}^\dagger \in D_{2^m}.\square \tag{4.14}$$

5 Twirling

When a quantum channel $\Phi : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ is a degradable channel, one can use the methodology of Smith and Smolin [6] to show that the quantum capacity of any twirl of Φ is at most the quantum capacity of Φ.

Lemma 5 *Let $\Phi : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ be a degradable quantum channel and $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ be a set of unitary matrices. Then*

$$Q(\Phi_{\mathcal{U}}) \le Q(\Phi) = I_{coh}(\Phi) \tag{5.1}$$

where $\Phi_{\mathcal{U}}$ is the twirl of the quantum channel Φ with respect to the set of unitary matrices $\mathcal{U}$.

Proof: Define $\Phi_{\mathsf{U}}, \bar{\Phi}_{\mathsf{U}} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ to be a linear map such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\mathsf{U}}(\rho) &:= \mathsf{U}^\dagger \Phi(\mathsf{U}\rho\mathsf{U}^\dagger)\mathsf{U} \\ \bar{\Phi}_{\mathsf{U}}(\rho) &:= \mathsf{U}^\dagger \Phi(\rho)\mathsf{U}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\rho\in\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{C}^d)} I_{coh}(\Phi_{\mathsf{U}},\rho) &= \max_{\rho\in\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{C}^d)} I_{coh}(\bar{\Phi}_{\mathsf{U}}, \mathsf{U}\rho\mathsf{U}^\dagger) \\ &= \max_{\rho\in\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{C}^d)} I_{coh}(\bar{\Phi}_{\mathsf{U}},\rho) \\ &= \max_{\rho\in\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{C}^d)} (S(\bar{\Phi}_{\mathsf{U}}(\rho)) - S(\bar{\Phi}_{\mathsf{U}}^C(\rho))) \\ &= \max_{\rho\in\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{C}^d)} (S(\bar{\Phi}_{\mathsf{U}}(\rho)) - S(\bar{\Phi}^C(\rho))) \\ &= \max_{\rho\in\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{C}^d)} (S(\mathsf{U}\Phi(\rho)\mathsf{U}^\dagger) - S(\Phi^C(\rho))) \\ &= \max_{\rho\in\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{C}^d)} (S(\Phi(\rho)) - S(\Phi^C(\rho))) \\ &= \max_{\rho\in\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{C}^d)} I_{coh}(\Phi,\rho). \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

The first equality follows from the definitions given in (5.2). The second equality follows because the set $\mathfrak{D}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ is invariant under conjugation by unitary matrices of size d. The third equality follows because of the definition of the coherent information. The fourth equality follows because of Proposition 5. The fifth inequality follows from the definitions in (5.2). The sixth equality follows from the invariance of the von Neumann entropy with respect to conjugation of its argument by a unitary operator. The last equality is from the definition of the coherent information. With (5.3), we can apply Lemma 1 on the quantum channel $\sum_{\mathsf{U}\in\mathcal{U}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|}\Phi_{\mathsf{U}}$ to get the result. $\square$

5.1 Pauli Twirling

Lemma 5 can be tightened if the set of unitary operators over which we twirl a quantum channel is known. Indeed, Smith and Smolin used a stronger result than Lemma 1 – Lemma 8 in [6] – to obtain the best upper bounds on $Q(\mathcal{D}_{p,2})$. Their lemma can be extended to apply to Pauli channels, and the proof technique is almost exactly the same as the proof of Lemma 8 in [6].

Lemma 6 *Let* $d = 2^m$*. Let* $\mathcal{N}_1, ..., \mathcal{N}_k : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ *be degradable channels. If* $\Phi : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^d) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ *is a channel such that*

$$\Phi = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i \mathcal{N}_i$$

for nonnegative $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_k$ *such that* $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i = 1$*, then there exists a quantum channel* $\tilde{\Phi} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$*, a degradable extension of* $\hat{\Phi}$*, such that*

$$Q\left(\hat{\Phi}\right) \leq Q(\tilde{\Phi}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i I_{coh}\left(\mathcal{N}_i, \frac{\mathbb{1}_d}{d}\right).$$

Proof: Define

$$\mathcal{N}_{i,\mathsf{P}}(\rho) := \mathsf{P}\mathcal{N}_i(\mathsf{P}\rho\mathsf{P})\mathsf{P} \tag{5.4}$$

and observe that since $\mathcal{N}_i$ is a degradable channel for all i and that every element of $\mathcal{P}_m$ is unitary, we also have that $\mathcal{N}_{i,\mathsf{P}}$ is a degradable channel for all i and for all $\mathsf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_m$.

Let $\mathcal{H}_A = \mathcal{H}_B = \mathbb{C}^d$ and $\mathcal{H}_E = \mathbb{C}^{d^2}$. Define the channel $\widetilde{\Phi} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E \otimes \mathcal{H}_F)$ to be

$$\widetilde{\Phi}(\rho) := \sum_i \lambda_i \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i(\rho) \otimes |i\rangle\langle i| \tag{5.5}$$

where for all i, the channel $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}_i} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_E)$ is given by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{N}_i}(\rho) := \sum_{\mathsf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_m} \frac{1}{2^{2d}} \mathcal{N}_{i,\mathsf{P}}(\rho) \otimes |\mathsf{P}\rangle\langle\mathsf{P}|. \tag{5.6}$$

By Lemma 1, $\widetilde{\Phi}$ is a degradable extension of $\sum_i \lambda_i \widehat{\mathcal{N}_i}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}_i}$ is a degradable extension of $\hat{\mathcal{N}_i}$. Thus

$$Q(\hat{\Phi}) \leq Q(\widetilde{\Phi}) \leq \sum_i \lambda_i Q(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}_i}) = \sum_i \lambda_i I_{coh}(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}_i}). \tag{5.7}$$

Now define $\star : \mathcal{P}_m \times \mathcal{P}_m \to \mathcal{P}_m$ to be a binary operation that multiplies Pauli matrices modulo the phases. Because $(\mathcal{P}_m, \star)$ is a group, we have that $\mathsf{P} \star \mathcal{P}_m = \mathcal{P}_m$ for all $\mathsf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_m$.

Observe that for all $\mathsf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_m$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathsf{P} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_E})\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i(\mathsf{P}\rho\mathsf{P})(\mathsf{P} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_E}) \\
=&\sum_{\mathsf{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_m} \frac{1}{2^{2d}} \mathsf{P}\mathsf{P}'\mathcal{N}_i(\mathsf{P}'\mathsf{P}\rho\mathsf{P}\mathsf{P}')\mathsf{P}'\mathsf{P} \otimes |\mathsf{P}'\rangle\langle\mathsf{P}'| \\
=&\sum_{\mathsf{P}' \in \mathsf{P}\star\mathcal{P}_m} \frac{1}{2^{2d}} \mathsf{P}\mathsf{P}'\mathcal{N}_i(\mathsf{P}'\mathsf{P}\rho\mathsf{P}\mathsf{P}')\mathsf{P}'\mathsf{P} \otimes |\mathsf{P}'\rangle\langle\mathsf{P}'| \\
=&\sum_{\mathsf{P}\star\mathsf{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_m} \frac{1}{2^{2d}} \mathsf{P}\mathsf{P}'\mathcal{N}_i(\mathsf{P}'\mathsf{P}\rho\mathsf{P}\mathsf{P}')\mathsf{P}'\mathsf{P} \otimes \mathsf{V}_\mathsf{P}|\mathsf{P}\star\mathsf{P}'\rangle\langle\mathsf{P}\star\mathsf{P}'|\mathsf{V}_\mathsf{P}^\dagger \\
=&\sum_{\mathsf{R} \in \mathcal{P}_m} \frac{1}{2^{2d}} \mathsf{R}\mathcal{N}_i(\mathsf{R}\rho\mathsf{R})\mathsf{R} \otimes \mathsf{V}_\mathsf{P}|\mathsf{R}\rangle\langle\mathsf{R}|\mathsf{V}_\mathsf{P}^\dagger \\
=&(\mathbb{1}_d \otimes \mathsf{V}_\mathsf{P})\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i(\rho)(\mathbb{1}_d \otimes \mathsf{V}_\mathsf{P}^\dagger)
\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

where the unitary matrix V_P is chosen such that $\mathsf{V}_\mathsf{P}|\mathsf{P}\star\mathsf{P}'\rangle = |\mathsf{P}'\rangle$. Therefore for all $\mathsf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_m$, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i(\mathsf{P}\rho\mathsf{P}) = (\mathsf{P} \otimes \mathsf{V}_\mathsf{P})\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i(\rho)(\mathsf{P} \otimes \mathsf{V}_\mathsf{P}). \tag{5.9}$$

Let K_i be a set of Kraus operators of the channel $\mathcal{N}_i$. Define

$$\widetilde{K}_i := \{2^{-d}\mathsf{P}\mathsf{A}\mathsf{P} \otimes |\mathsf{P}\rangle : \mathsf{A} \in K_i, \mathsf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_m\}. \tag{5.10}$$

Then $\widetilde{K}_i$ is a set of Kraus operators for the channel $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i$. Thus the isometric extension of $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i$ is $\widetilde{W}_i : \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_E \otimes \mathcal{H}_\kappa \otimes \mathcal{H}_{E'})$ where

$$\widetilde{W}_i := \sum_{\substack{\mathsf{A} \in K_i \\ \mathsf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_m}} 2^{-d}\mathsf{P}\mathsf{A}\mathsf{P} \otimes |\mathsf{P}\rangle \otimes |\mathsf{A}\rangle \otimes |\mathsf{P}\rangle. \tag{5.11}$$

Similarly, the isometric extension of $\mathcal{N}_{i,\mathsf{P}}$ is $W_{i,\mathsf{P}} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_\kappa)$ where

$$W_{i,\mathsf{P}} := \sum_{\mathsf{A} \in K_i} 2^{-d}\mathsf{P}\mathsf{A}\mathsf{P} \otimes |\mathsf{A}\rangle. \tag{5.12}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N}_{i,\mathsf{P}}^C(\rho) &= \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_A}(W_{i,\mathsf{P}}\rho W_{i,\mathsf{P}}^\dagger) \\
&= \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_A}\left(\sum_{\mathsf{A},\mathsf{A}' \in K_i} 2^{-2d}\mathsf{P}\mathsf{A}\mathsf{P}\rho\mathsf{P}\mathsf{A}'\mathsf{P} \otimes |\mathsf{A}\rangle\langle\mathsf{A}'|\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

Now observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i^C(\rho) &= \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_A\otimes\mathcal{H}_E}\left(\widetilde{W}_i\rho\widetilde{W}_i^\dagger\right)\\
&= \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_A}\left(\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_E}\left(\widetilde{W}_i\rho\widetilde{W}_i^\dagger\right)\right)\\
&= \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_A}\left(\sum_{\substack{\mathsf{A},\mathsf{A}'\in K_i\\ \mathsf{P}\in\mathcal{P}_m}} 2^{-2d}\mathsf{PAP}\rho\mathsf{PA}'\mathsf{P}\otimes|\mathsf{A}\rangle\langle\mathsf{A}'|\otimes|\mathsf{P}\rangle\langle\mathsf{P}|\right)\\
&= \sum_{\mathsf{P}\in\mathcal{P}_m}\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_A}\left(\sum_{\mathsf{A},\mathsf{A}'\in K_i} 2^{-2d}\mathsf{PAP}\rho\mathsf{PA}'\mathsf{P}\otimes|\mathsf{A}\rangle\langle\mathsf{A}'|\right)\otimes|\mathsf{P}\rangle\langle\mathsf{P}|\\
&= \sum_{\mathsf{P}\in\mathcal{P}_m}\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_A}\left(W_{i,\mathsf{P}}\rho W_{i,\mathsf{P}}^\dagger\right)\otimes|\mathsf{P}\rangle\langle\mathsf{P}|\\
&= \sum_{\mathsf{P}\in\mathcal{P}_m}\frac{1}{2^{2d}}\mathcal{N}_{i,\mathsf{P}}^C(\rho)\otimes|\mathsf{P}\rangle\langle\mathsf{P}|. \qquad (5.14)
\end{aligned}$$

Then by the same argument as in (5.8), we have that

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i^C(\mathsf{P}\rho\mathsf{P}) = (\mathsf{P}\otimes\mathsf{V}_\mathsf{P})\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i^C(\rho)(\mathsf{P}\otimes\mathsf{V}_\mathsf{P}). \qquad (5.15)$$

Using (5.12) and (5.15) and the fact that the von Neumann entropy S is invariant under unitary conjugation of its argument, we have that for all $\mathsf{P}\in\mathcal{P}_m$,

$$\begin{aligned}
S(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i(\mathsf{P}\rho\mathsf{P})) &= S(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i(\rho))\\
S(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i^C(\mathsf{P}\rho\mathsf{P})) &= S(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i^C(\rho)) \qquad (5.16)
\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$I_{coh}(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i,\mathsf{P}\rho\mathsf{P}) = I_{coh}(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i,\rho) \qquad (5.17)$$

Since $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i$ is a degradable channel, its coherent information is a concave function with respect to the input state, and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{coh}(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i,\rho) &= \frac{1}{2^{2d}}\sum_{\mathsf{P}\in\mathcal{P}_m} I_{coh}(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i,\mathsf{P}\rho\mathsf{P})\\
&\le I_{coh}\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i,\frac{1}{2^{2d}}\sum_{\mathsf{P}\in\mathcal{P}_m}\mathsf{P}\rho\mathsf{P}\right)\\
&= I_{coh}\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i,\frac{\mathbb{1}_d}{d}\right). \qquad (5.18)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\sum_i \lambda_i I_{coh}(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i) = \sum_i \lambda_i I_{coh}\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_i,\frac{\mathbb{1}_d}{d}\right). \quad \square \qquad (5.19)$$

The effect of twirling $\Phi_{x,y,z}$ to a Pauli channel is stated by the following proposition.

Theorem 4 *For values of x, y and z where $\Phi_{x,y,z} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4)$ is a quantum channel, $\Phi_{x,y,z}$ can be twirled to a Pauli channel $\hat{\Phi}_{x,y,z} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4)$ with the Kraus operators*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{1+2\sqrt{1-x}+\sqrt{1-2y}}{4}\right)\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathbb{1}, \\
&\left(\frac{1-\sqrt{1-2y}}{4}\right)\mathsf{P}, \quad \mathsf{P}\in\{\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{Z}, \mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathbb{1}\} \\
&\left(\frac{1-2\sqrt{1-x}+\sqrt{1-2y}}{4}\right)\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{Z} \\
&\left(\frac{\sqrt{x}+\sqrt{y}}{4}\right)^2\mathsf{P}, \quad \mathsf{P}\in\{\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{X}, \mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{Y}, \mathsf{X}\otimes\mathbb{1}, \mathsf{Y}\otimes\mathbb{1}\} \\
&\left(\frac{\sqrt{x}-\sqrt{y}}{4}\right)\mathsf{P}, \quad \mathsf{P}\in\{\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{X}, \mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{Y}, \mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{Z}, \mathsf{Y}\otimes\mathsf{Z}\} \\
&\frac{\sqrt{z}}{2}\mathsf{P}, \quad \mathsf{P}\in\{\mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{X}, \mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{Y}, \mathsf{Y}\otimes\mathsf{X}, \mathsf{Y}\otimes\mathsf{Y}\}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

with probability of weight i Pauli's being $P_i(\hat{\Phi}_{x,y,z})$ where

$$P_0(\Phi_{x,y,z}) = \left(\frac{1+2s_1+s_2}{4}\right)^2 \tag{5.21}$$

$$P_1(\Phi_{x,y,z}) = 2\left(\frac{1-s_2}{4}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\sqrt{x}+\sqrt{y}}{2}\right)^2 \tag{5.22}$$

$$P_2(\Phi_{x,y,z}) = \left(\frac{1-2s_1+s_2}{4}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\sqrt{x}-\sqrt{y}}{2}\right)^2 + \frac{z}{4} \tag{5.23}$$

with $s_1 = \sqrt{1-x}$ and $s_2 = \sqrt{1-2y-z}$.

Proof: Substituting the equations (A.1) to (A.10) into the equations (3.5), we can express the Kraus operators of $\Phi_{x,y,z}$ in the Pauli basis to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{A}_1 &= \frac{\sqrt{x}+\sqrt{y}}{4}(\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{X}+i\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{Y}) + \frac{\sqrt{x}-\sqrt{y}}{4}(\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{X}+i\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{Y}) \\
\mathsf{A}_2 &= \frac{\sqrt{x}+\sqrt{y}}{4}(\mathsf{X}\otimes\mathbb{1}+i\mathsf{Y}\otimes\mathbb{1}) + \frac{\sqrt{x}-\sqrt{y}}{4}(\mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{Z}+i\mathsf{Y}\otimes\mathsf{Z}) \\
\mathsf{A}_3 &= \frac{\sqrt{z}}{4}(\mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{X}-\mathsf{Y}\otimes\mathsf{Y}+i(\mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{Y}+\mathsf{Y}\otimes\mathsf{X})) \\
\mathsf{A}_0 &= \frac{1+2\sqrt{1-x}+\sqrt{1-2y}}{4}\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathbb{1} + \frac{1-\sqrt{1-2y}}{4}(\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathbb{1}+\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{Z}) \\
&\quad + \frac{1-2\sqrt{1-x}+\sqrt{1-2y}}{4}\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{Z}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

Then by applying (2.6) on (5.24), we find that the probability of the two qubit Pauli's being applied by channel $\hat{\Phi}_{x,y,z}$ are given by (5.20). Then one may compute the probabilities of $\hat{\Phi}_{x,y,z}$ having Pauli errors of the corresponding weights to obtain the result. □

5.2 Localized Clifford Twirling

To obtain locally symmetric Pauli channels, we introduce the notion of localized Clifford twirling. Instead of twirling our channel over the entire Clifford group over all the qubits [24], we can twirl the channel with respect to the Clifford group for individual qubits independently. The material below is an explicit discussion on the notion of localized Clifford twirling.

Now define $\mathcal{P}_1^* := \{\mathsf{X}, \mathsf{Y}, \mathsf{Z}\}$. We study a set of automorphisms on $\mathcal{P}_1^*$. To define this set of automorphisms, we first define a Hermitian and traceless qubit operator

$$\mathsf{H}_{\tau_1,\tau_2} := \frac{\tau_1 + \tau_2}{\sqrt{2}} \tag{5.25}$$

for all $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathcal{P}_1^*$. For all $\mathsf{W} \in \mathcal{P}_1^*$, conjugation of W with $\mathsf{H}_{\tau_1,\tau_2}$ gives the following.

$$\mathsf{H}_{\tau_1,\tau_2}\mathsf{W}\mathsf{H}_{\tau_1,\tau_2} = \begin{cases} \tau_1 & , \quad \mathsf{W} = \tau_2 \\ \tau_2 & , \quad \mathsf{W} = \tau_1 \\ -\mathsf{W} & , \quad \mathsf{W} \notin \{\tau_1, \tau_2\} \end{cases} \tag{5.26}$$

Hence the automorphism associated with $\mathsf{H}_{\tau_1,\tau_2}$ on $\mathcal{P}_1^*$ swaps τ_1 and τ_2. The size of the set of all automorphisms on $\mathcal{P}_1^*$ is the size of the symmetric group of order 3, which is 6. Hence we consider the set

$$\mathcal{B} := \{\mathbb{1}, \mathsf{H}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}, \mathsf{H}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Z}}, \mathsf{H}_{\mathsf{Y},\mathsf{Z}}, \mathsf{H}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Z}}\mathsf{H}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}, \mathsf{H}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}\mathsf{H}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Z}}\} \tag{5.27}$$

with six qubit operators, each operator corresponding to a distinct automorphism of $\mathcal{P}_1^*$. For all $\mathsf{P}, \mathsf{V} \in \mathcal{P}_1$, observe that

$$\frac{1}{6}\sum_{\mathsf{B}\in\mathcal{B}} (\mathsf{BPB})\mathsf{V}(\mathsf{BPB}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{3}\sum_{\mathsf{P}'\in\mathcal{P}_1^*} \mathsf{P}'\mathsf{V}\mathsf{P}' & , \quad \mathsf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_1^* \\ \mathsf{V} & , \quad \mathsf{P} = \mathbb{1} \end{cases} . \tag{5.28}$$

When $\mathcal{N} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4)$ is a Pauli-diagonal channel that maps two qubits to two qubits, we define $(\mathcal{N})_1 : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4)$ to be the localized Clifford twirl of $\mathcal{N}$ on the first qubit where

$$(\mathcal{N})_1(\rho) := \frac{1}{6}\sum_{\mathsf{B}\in\mathcal{B}} (\mathsf{B}\otimes\mathbb{1})\mathcal{N}((\mathsf{B}\otimes\mathbb{1})\rho(\mathsf{B}\otimes\mathbb{1}))(\mathsf{B}\otimes\mathbb{1}) \tag{5.29}$$

and ρ is a two qubit density matrix. Similarly, we define $(\mathcal{N})_{1,2} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4)$ to be the localized Clifford twirl of $\mathcal{N}$ on the first and second qubit. In particular,

$$(\mathcal{N})_{1,2}(\rho) := \frac{1}{6}\sum_{\mathsf{B}\in\mathcal{B}} (\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{B})(\mathcal{N})_1((\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{B})\rho(\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{B}))(\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{B}). \tag{5.30}$$

Lemma 7 describes the effect of performing localized Clifford twirling on two-qubit Pauli channels.

Lemma 7 (Localized Clifford Twirling) *Let $\mathcal{N}$ be a two qubit Pauli diagonal channel with the set of Kraus operators*

$$\left\{\sqrt{a_{\mathsf{P}\otimes\mathsf{P}'}}\mathsf{P}\otimes\mathsf{P}' : \mathsf{P}, \mathsf{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_1\right\} \tag{5.31}$$

where

$$\sum_{\mathsf{P},\mathsf{P}'\in\mathcal{P}_1^*} a_{\mathsf{P}\otimes\mathsf{P}'} = 1,$$

and $a_{\mathsf{P}\otimes\mathsf{P}'} \geq 0$ for all $\mathsf{P}, \mathsf{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_1$. Let $\mathcal{N}'$ be a quantum channel with Kraus operators

$$\sqrt{a_{\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathbb{1}}}\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathbb{1}, \quad \sqrt{\sum_{\mathsf{R}\in\mathcal{P}_1^*}\frac{a_{\mathsf{R}\otimes\mathbb{1}}}{3}}\mathsf{P}\otimes\mathbb{1}$$

$$\sqrt{\sum_{\mathsf{R}'\in\mathcal{P}_1^*}\frac{a_{\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{R}'}}{3}}\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{P}', \quad \sqrt{\sum_{\mathsf{R},\mathsf{R}'\in\mathcal{P}_1^*}\frac{a_{\mathsf{R}\otimes\mathsf{R}'}}{9}}\mathsf{P}\otimes\mathsf{P}'. \tag{5.32}$$

where $\mathsf{P}, \mathsf{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_1^*$. Then $(\mathcal{N})_{1,2} = \mathcal{N}'$.

Proof: Let $\mathsf{V}, \mathsf{W} \in \mathcal{P}_1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathcal{N})_1(\mathsf{V} \otimes \mathsf{W}) \\
=&\frac{1}{6} \sum_{\mathsf{B} \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{\mathsf{P}, \mathsf{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_1} \mathsf{BPBVBPB} \otimes \mathsf{P'WP'} a_{\mathsf{P} \otimes \mathsf{P}'} \\
=&\frac{1}{6} \sum_{\mathsf{P}, \mathsf{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_1} \left(\sum_{\mathsf{B} \in \mathcal{B}} (\mathsf{BPB})\mathsf{V}(\mathsf{BPB}) \right) \otimes \mathsf{P'WP'} a_{\mathsf{P} \otimes \mathsf{P}'} \\
=& \sum_{\mathsf{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_1} \mathsf{V} \otimes \mathsf{P'WP'} a_{\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathsf{P}'} \\
&+ \frac{1}{3} \sum_{\mathsf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_1^*} \left(\sum_{\mathsf{R} \in \mathcal{P}_1^*} \mathsf{RVR} \right) \otimes \sum_{\mathsf{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_1} \mathsf{P'WP'} a_{\mathsf{P} \otimes \mathsf{P}'}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.33}$$

The last equality in (5.33) follows from using (5.28). By rearranging the terms in (5.33), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathcal{N})_1(\mathsf{V} \otimes \mathsf{W}) \\
=&V \otimes \sum_{\mathsf{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_1} \mathsf{P'WP'} a_{\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathsf{P}'} \\
&+ \left(\sum_{\mathsf{R} \in \mathcal{P}_1^*} \mathsf{RVR} \right) \otimes \sum_{\mathsf{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_1} \mathsf{P'WP'} \sum_{\mathsf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_1^*} \frac{a_{\mathsf{P} \otimes \mathsf{P}'}}{3}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.34}$$

Similarly, we can compute the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathcal{N})_{1,2}(\mathsf{V} \otimes \mathsf{W}) \\
=&\mathsf{V} \otimes \frac{1}{6} \sum_{\mathsf{B} \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{\mathsf{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_1} (\mathsf{BP'B})\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{BP'B}) a_{\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathsf{P}'} \\
&+ \left(\sum_{\mathsf{R} \in \mathcal{P}_1^*} \mathsf{RVR} \right) \otimes \frac{1}{6} \sum_{\mathsf{B} \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{\mathsf{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_1} (\mathsf{BP'B})\mathsf{W}(\mathsf{BP'B}) \left(\sum_{\mathsf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_1^*} \frac{a_{\mathsf{P} \otimes \mathsf{P}'}}{3} \right) \\
=&a_{\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1}} \mathsf{V} \otimes \mathsf{W} + \mathsf{V} \otimes \left(\sum_{\mathsf{R}' \in \mathcal{P}_1^*} \mathsf{R'WR'} \right) \left(\sum_{\mathsf{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_1^*} \frac{a_{\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathsf{P}'}}{3} \right) \\
&+ \left(\sum_{\mathsf{R} \in \mathcal{P}_1^*} \mathsf{RVR} \right) \otimes \mathsf{W} \left(\sum_{\mathsf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_1^*} \frac{a_{\mathsf{P} \otimes \mathbb{1}}}{3} \right) \\
&+ \left(\sum_{\mathsf{R} \in \mathcal{P}_1^*} \mathsf{RVR} \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{\mathsf{R}' \in \mathcal{P}_1^*} \mathsf{R'VR'} \right) \sum_{\mathsf{P}, \mathsf{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_1^*} \frac{a_{\mathsf{P} \otimes \mathsf{P}'}}{9}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.35}$$

Thus, for all $\mathsf{V}, \mathsf{W} \in \mathcal{P}_1$,

$$(\mathcal{N})_{1,2}(\mathsf{V} \otimes \mathsf{W}) = (\mathcal{N}')(\mathsf{V} \otimes \mathsf{W}). \tag{5.36}$$

Thus, by linearity of $(\mathcal{N})_{1,2}$ and $\mathcal{N}'$, $(\mathcal{N})_{1,2} = \mathcal{N}'$. □

6 Quantum Capacity of Some Two-Qubit Channels

This section presents the main results of this paper. Section 6.1 gives a simple way to evaluate the quantum capacity of some two-qubit amplitude damping channels. Section 6.2 gives new upper bounds on the quantum capacity of some two-qubit Pauli channels, including upper bounds on the quantum capacity of the four-dimension depolarizing channel.

6.1 Amplitude Damping Channels

Theorem 3 *When* $x, y, z \geq 0$ *and* $2y + z < 1$, *the quantum capacity of* $\Phi_{x,y,z} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4)$ *defined by (3.4) is the optimal value of the following concave program with linear constraints.*

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & \eta(p_1 + p_2 x + p_3 x + p_4 z) + \eta(p_2(1-x) + p_4 y) \\
& + \eta(p_3(1-x) + p_4 y) + \eta(p_4(1-2y-z)) \\
& - \eta(p_1 + p_2(1-x) + p_3(1-x) + p_4(1-2y-z)) - \eta(p_2 x + p_4 y) \\
& - \eta(p_3 x + p_4 y) - \eta(p_4 z) \\
\text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{4} p_i = 1 \\
& p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 \geq 0
\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

Proof: Recall that $\Phi^C_{x,y,z} = \Phi_{1-x,y,1-2y-z}$. Thus requirements of Corollary 1 are satisfied for both $\Phi_{x,y,z}$ and $\Phi^C_{x,y,z}$, which implies that these two channels are both of the form (4.1) and satisfy the covariance property of Lemma 3. Hence the requirement of Theorem 1 is satisfied and

$$Q(\Phi_{x,y,z}) = \max_{\rho \in \tilde{D}_4} I_{coh}(\Phi_{x,y,z}, \rho). \tag{6.2}$$

By elementary algebra, we can rewrite the above equation into the optimization program given by the theorem. The objective function is concave [23] because of $\Phi_{x,y,z}$ is a degradable channel. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Phi_{x,y,z}(\mathrm{diag}(p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)) \\
= & \mathrm{diag}(p_1, (1-x)p_2, (1-x)p_3, (1-2y-z)p_4) \\
& + \mathrm{diag}(p_2 x, 0, p_4 y, 0) + \mathrm{diag}(p_3 x, p_4 y, 0, 0) + \mathrm{diag}(p_4 z, 0, 0, 0) \\
= & (p_1 + p_2 x + p_3 x + p_4 z)|0\rangle\langle 0| + (p_2(1-x) + p_4 y)|1\rangle\langle 1| \\
& + (p_3(1-x) + p_4 y)|2\rangle\langle 2| + p_4(1-2y-z)|3\rangle\langle 3|.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Phi^C_{x,y,z}(\mathrm{diag}(p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)) \\
= & (p_1 + p_2(1-x) + p_3(1-x) + p_4(1-2y-z))|0\rangle\langle 0| + (p_2 x + p_4 y)|1\rangle\langle 1| \\
& + (p_3 x + p_4 y)|2\rangle\langle 2| + p_4 z|3\rangle\langle 3|.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

Using (6.3) and (6.4), we can simplify $I_{coh}(\Phi_{x,y,z}, \rho)$ to the objective function stated by Theorem 3. □

6.2 Two-Qubit Pauli Channels

The key result of this paper is the following theorem.

Theorem 4 *For all* $x, y, z \geq 0$ *and* $2y+z < 1, x < \frac{1}{2}$, *there exists a channel* $\tilde{\Phi}_{x,y,z} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$ *such that* $Q(\hat{\Phi}_{x,y,z})$ *is at most*

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\tilde{\Phi}_{x,y,z}) \leq \eta\left(\frac{1+2x+z}{4}\right) + 2\eta\left(\frac{1-x+y}{4}\right) + \eta\left(\frac{1-2y-z}{4}\right) \\ - \eta\left(1 - \frac{2x+2y+z}{4}\right) - 2\eta\left(\frac{x+y}{4}\right) - \eta\left(\frac{z}{4}\right) \qquad (6.5) \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\Phi}_{x,y,z} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^{2^m}) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^{2^m})$ *is the Pauli-twirl of* $\Phi_{x,y,z} : \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{C}^4)$ *and* $\tilde{\Phi}_{x,y,z}$ *is a degradable extension of* $\hat{\Phi}_{x,y,z}$.

Proof: The quantum channel $\Phi_{x,y,z}$ defined in (3.4) is degradable by Lemma 2, and we are obtaining an upper bound on the Pauli twirl of $\Phi_{x,y,z}$. Hence applying Lemma 6, we find that there exists $\tilde{\Phi}_{x,y,z}$, a degradable extension of $\hat{\Phi}_{x,y,z}$, such that

$$Q(\hat{\Phi}_{x,y,z}) \leq Q(\tilde{\Phi}_{x,y,z}) \leq I_{coh}\left(\bar{\Phi}_{x,y,z}, \frac{\mathbb{1}_4}{4}\right). \quad \square \qquad (6.6)$$

With this theorem, we can obtain two corollaries.

Corollary 2 *For* $0 \leq p \leq \frac{3}{8}$, *an upper bound on* $Q(\mathcal{D}_{p,4})$ *is the convex hull of the functions*

$$\eta\left(\frac{1+3x}{4}\right) + 3\eta\left(\frac{1-x}{4}\right) - \eta\left(1 - \frac{3x}{4}\right) - 3\eta\left(\frac{x}{4}\right) \qquad (6.7)$$

and $1 - \frac{8p}{3}$ *where*

$$x = \frac{8}{9}(\sqrt{1-p} - 1 + 2p). \qquad (6.8)$$

Proof: Using Theorem 4, the Pauli twirl of the channel $\Phi_{x,0,x}$ has a quantum capacity at most

$$\eta\left(\frac{1+3x}{4}\right) + 3\eta\left(\frac{1-x}{4}\right) - \eta\left(1 - \frac{3x}{4}\right) - 3\eta\left(\frac{x}{4}\right). \qquad (6.9)$$

We may further twirl $\hat{\Phi}_{x,0,x}$ over the Clifford group over two qubits to get $\mathcal{D}_{p,4}$, where x is given by (6.8). Applying Lemma 5 on the complete Clifford twirl of $\hat{\Phi}_{x,0,x}$, we find that $Q(\mathcal{D}_{p,4})$ is at most the value of the expression (6.9). From Cerf's no-cloning bound (2.8), we know that there exists $\mathcal{E}$, a degradable extension of $\mathcal{D}_{\frac{3}{8},4}$, with a quantum capacity of zero. By taking convex combinations of the degradable extensions of the identity channel and $\mathcal{E}$ and applying Lemma 1, an upper bound of $Q(\mathcal{D}_{p,4})$ is $1 - \frac{8p}{3}$. By taking the convex hull of our two upper bounds using Lemma 1 again, the result follows. □

The next corollary gives an upper bound on the quantum capacity of locally symmetric Pauli channels.

Corollary 3 *For* $x, y, z \geq 0, 2y + z < 1, x < \frac{1}{2}$*, the quantum capacity of the two-qubit Pauli channels with the Kraus operators*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{q_0}\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1}, \\
&\sqrt{\frac{q_1}{6}}\mathsf{P}, \quad \mathsf{P} \in \{\mathsf{R} \in \mathcal{P}_2 : \mathrm{wt}(\mathsf{R}) = 1\} \\
&\frac{\sqrt{q_2}}{3}\mathsf{P}, \quad \mathsf{P} \in \{\mathsf{R} \in \mathcal{P}_2 : \mathrm{wt}(\mathsf{R}) = 2\} \qquad (6.10)
\end{aligned}$$

has a quantum capacity at most the right hand side of the inequality (6.5) where

$$\begin{aligned}
q_0 &= \frac{1 + 2\sqrt{1-x} + \sqrt{1-2y-z}}{4} \\
q_1 &= \sqrt{\frac{(1 - \sqrt{1-2y-z})^2}{8} + \frac{(\sqrt{x} + \sqrt{y})^2}{4}} \\
q_2 &= \sqrt{\frac{(1 - 2\sqrt{1-x} + \sqrt{1-2y-z})^2}{16} + \frac{(\sqrt{x} - \sqrt{y})^2}{4} + \frac{z}{4}}. \qquad (6.11)
\end{aligned}$$

Proof: By Proposition 4 and Lemma 7, the localized Clifford twirl of the Pauli twirl of $\Phi_{x,y,z}$ is precisely the channel given by the above. The result then follows by applying Lemma 5 on the degradable extension of $\hat{\hat{\Phi}}_{x,y,z}$ which exists by Theorem 4, and the value of the upper bound of the quantum capacity of $(\hat{\hat{\Phi}}_{x,y,z})_{1,2}$ is the expression given by the right hand side of the inequality (6.5). □

7 Discussions

Evaluating upper bounds on the quantum capacity of quantum channels is an important problem, and in this paper, we work towards the resolution of this problem. For degradable channels, we show that if they satisfy the property where they and their complements are both covariant with respect to a set diagonal Pauli matrices, then their quantum capacity is the maximum value of a concave function subject to linear constraints. This technical result makes evaluating the quantum capacity of special families of high dimension degradable channels a much more tractable optimization problem.

We also obtain upper bounds on the quantum capacity of some two-qubit channels. We introduce a two-qubit amplitude damping channel $\Phi_{x,y,z}$ and give a way to evaluate its quantum capacity when it is a degradable channel. Using this the channel $\Phi_{x,y,z}$ when it is degradable, we thereby obtain new upper bounds of $Q(\mathcal{D}_{p,4})$. By performing local Clifford twirling on the Pauli twirl of $\Phi_{x,y,z}$, we obtain upper bounds on the quantum capacity of locally symmetric Pauli channels. Since the family of locally symmetric Pauli channels includes the channels $\mathcal{D}_{p,2} \otimes \mathcal{D}_{p,2}$, we indirectly obtain upper bounds on the quantum capacity of $\mathcal{D}_{p,2}$. Curiously, we only manage to reproduce Smith and Smolin's upper bound of $Q(\mathcal{D}_{p,2})$ [6] using this technique.

From Lemma 6, one can show that the Pauli-twirling of many two qubit degradable channels strictly decreases the quantum capacity, just as in the case for qubit degradable channels. We do not know if further Clifford twirling also strictly reduces the quantum capacity, although we conjecture that it is true. If it were possible to quantify the amount by which the quantum capacity decreases on further Clifford twirling, we would be able to improve the upper bounds of $Q(\mathcal{D}_{p,d})$ for $d = 2, 4$. We leave the resolution of this problem for future work.

8 Acknowledgements

I like to thank Debbie Leung for useful discussions, Easwar Magesan for helping me learn about Pauli-twirled channels [25], and Graeme Smith for pointing out that the bound given by Corollary 7 in [6] is much easier to evaluate than the bound given by Theorem 6 in [6]. I also like to thank the anonymous referees who have made numerous helpful comments.

A Appendix

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
4|0\rangle\langle 3| &= \mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{X}-\mathsf{Y}\otimes\mathsf{Y}+i(\mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{Y}+\mathsf{Y}\otimes\mathsf{X}) && \text{(A.1)}\\
4|0\rangle\langle 3| &= \mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{X}+\mathsf{Y}\otimes\mathsf{Y}+i(-\mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{Y}+\mathsf{Y}\otimes\mathsf{X}) && \text{(A.2)}\\
4|0\rangle\langle 2| &= \mathsf{X}\otimes\mathbb{1}+\mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{Z}+i(\mathsf{Y}\otimes\mathbb{1}+\mathsf{Y}\otimes\mathsf{Z}) && \text{(A.3)}\\
4|1\rangle\langle 3| &= \mathsf{X}\otimes\mathbb{1}-\mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{Z}+i(\mathsf{Y}\otimes\mathbb{1}-\mathsf{Y}\otimes\mathsf{Z}) && \text{(A.4)}\\
4|0\rangle\langle 1| &= \mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{X}+\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{X}+i(\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{Y}+\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{Y}) && \text{(A.5)}\\
4|2\rangle\langle 3| &= \mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{X}-\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{X}+i(\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{Y}-\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{Y}). && \text{(A.6)}
\end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned}
4|0\rangle\langle 0| &= \mathbb{1}\otimes\mathbb{1}+\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{Z}+\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathbb{1}+\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{Z} && \text{(A.7)}\\
4|1\rangle\langle 1| &= \mathbb{1}\otimes\mathbb{1}-\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{Z}+\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathbb{1}-\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{Z} && \text{(A.8)}\\
4|2\rangle\langle 2| &= \mathbb{1}\otimes\mathbb{1}+\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{Z}-\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathbb{1}-\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{Z} && \text{(A.9)}\\
4|3\rangle\langle 3| &= \mathbb{1}\otimes\mathbb{1}-\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathsf{Z}-\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathbb{1}+\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{Z}. && \text{(A.10)}
\end{aligned}$$

We can also rewrite the above matrices in the following form.

$$\begin{aligned}
|0\rangle\langle 3| &= (|0\rangle\langle 0|)(\mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{X}) && \text{(A.11)}\\
|0\rangle\langle 2| &= (|0\rangle\langle 0|)(\mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{Z}) && \text{(A.12)}\\
|1\rangle\langle 3| &= (-|1\rangle\langle 1|)(\mathsf{X}\otimes\mathsf{Z}) && \text{(A.13)}\\
|0\rangle\langle 1| &= (|0\rangle\langle 0|)(\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{X}) && \text{(A.14)}\\
|2\rangle\langle 3| &= (-|2\rangle\langle 2|)(\mathsf{Z}\otimes\mathsf{X}) && \text{(A.15)}
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 5 *Let $\Phi, \Phi' : \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ be quantum channels such that for all $\rho \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A)$*

$$\Phi'(\rho) = \mathsf{V}\Phi(\rho)\mathsf{V}^\dagger \tag{A.16}$$

where $\mathsf{V} : \mathcal{H}_B \to \mathcal{H}_B$ is some unitary operator. Then for all $\rho \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A)$,

$$(\Phi')^C(\rho) = \Phi^C(\rho) \tag{A.17}$$

Proof: *Suppose that Φ' has the Kraus decomposition $\Phi(\rho) = \sum_k \mathsf{A}_k\rho\mathsf{A}_k^\dagger$. Let $W, W' : \mathcal{H}_A \to \mathcal{H}_E \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ we isometric extensions of Φ and Φ' respectively where $W = \sum_k |k\rangle \otimes \mathsf{A}_k$ and*

$W' = \sum_k |k\rangle \otimes \mathsf{V}\mathsf{A}_k$. *Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Phi')^C(\rho) &= \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B}\left(\sum_{j,k} |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes \mathsf{V}\mathsf{A}_j\rho\mathsf{A}_k^\dagger\mathsf{V}^\dagger\right) \\
&= \sum_{j,k} |j\rangle\langle k| \,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathsf{V}\mathsf{A}_j\rho\mathsf{A}_k^\dagger\mathsf{V}^\dagger\right) \\
&= \sum_{j,k} |j\rangle\langle k| \,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathsf{A}_j\rho\mathsf{A}_k^\dagger\right) \\
&= \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B}\left(\sum_{j,k} |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes \mathsf{A}_j\rho\mathsf{A}_k^\dagger\right) \\
&= \Phi^C(\rho). \qquad\qquad \square
\end{aligned} \tag{A.18}$$

References

[1] M. M. Wilde, "From classical to quantum shannon theory," 2011. quant-ph/1106.1445.

[2] N. J. Cerf, "Quantum cloning and the capacity of the Pauli channel," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 84, p. 4497, 2000.

[3] E. M. Rains, "Bounds on distillable entanglement," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 60, pp. 179–184, 1999.

[4] E. M. Rains, "A semidefinite program for distillable entanglement," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 2921–2933, 2001.

[5] G. Smith, J. A. Smolin, and A. Winter, "The quantum capacity with symmetric side channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 4208–4217, 2008.

[6] G. Smith and J. A. Smolin, "Additive extensions of a quantum channel," *IEEE Information Theory Workshop*, vol. 54, pp. 368 – 372, May 2008.

[7] C. Adami and N. J. Cerf, "Von Neumann capacity of noisy quantum channels," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 56, pp. 3470–3483, Nov 1997.

[8] D. P. DiVincenzo, P. W. Shor, and J. A. Smolin, "Quantum channel capacity of very noisy channels," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 57, pp. 830 – 839, 1998.

[9] G. Smith and J. A. Smolin, "Degenerate quantum codes for Pauli channels," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 98, p. 030501, 2007.

[10] J. Fern and K. B. Whaley, "Lower bounds on the nonzero capacity of Pauli channels," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 78, p. 062335, 2008.

[11] P. Shor, "Lecture notes, MSRI Workshop on Quantum Computation.," 2002.

[12] V. Giovannetti and R. Fazio, "Information-capacity description of spin-chain correlations," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 71, p. 032314, 2005.

[13] A. Holevo, "A note on covariant dynamical semigroups," *Reports on Mathematical Physics*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 211 – 216, 1993.

[14] M. M. Wolf and D. Perez-Garcia, “Quantum capacities of channels with small environment,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 75, p. 012303, 2007.

[15] K. Kraus, *Lecture Notes in Physics 190 : States, Effects, and Operations Fundamental Notions of Quantum Theory.* Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, first ed., 1983.

[16] I. Devetak and P. W. Shor, “The capacity of a quantum channel for simultaneous transmission of classical and quantum information,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 256, pp. 287–303, 2005. 10.1007/s00220-005-1317-6.

[17] C. King, K. Matsumoto, M. Nathanson, and M. B. Ruskai, “Properties of conjugate channels with applications to additivity and multiplicativity,” *Markov Process and Related Fields*, vol. 13, p. 391, 2007.

[18] B. Schumacher and M. A. Nielsen, “Quantum data processing and error correction,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 54, p. 2629, 1996.

[19] S. Lloyd, “The capacity of the noisy quantum channel,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 55, p. 1613, 1997.

[20] I. Devetak, “The private classical capacity and quantum capacity of a quantum channel,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, p. 44, 2005.

[21] H. Barnum, M. A. Nielsen, and B. Schumacher, “Information transmission through a noisy quantum channel,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 57, pp. 4153–4175, Jun 1998.

[22] C. Dankert, R. Cleve, J. Emerson, and E. Livine, “Exact and approximate unitary 2-designs and their application to fidelity estimation,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 80, p. 012304, Jul 2009.

[23] J. Yard, P. M. Hayden, and I. Devetak, “Capacity theorems for quantum multiple-access channels: Classical-quantum and quantum-quantum capacity regions,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 54, no. 7, pp. 3091–3113, 2008.

[24] D. DiVincenzo, D. Leung, and B. Terhal, “Quantum data hiding,” *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 48, pp. 580 –598, mar 2002.

[25] M. Silva, E. Magesan, D. W. Kribs, and J. Emerson, “Experimentally scalable protocol for identification of correctable codes,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 78, p. 012347, 2008.